



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

11-D

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/823,600

04/14/2004

Gregory G. Jones

003797.00776

6239

28319 7590 03/12/2007

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

ATTORNEYS FOR CLIENT NOS. 003797 & 013797

1100 13th STREET, N.W.

SUITE 1200

WASHINGTON, DC 20005-4051

EXAMINER

KARIMI, PEGEMAN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2609

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
--	-----------	---------------

3 MONTHS

03/12/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/823,600

Applicant(s)

JONES ET AL.

Examiner

Pegeman Karimi

Art Unit

2609

– The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address –

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14/April/2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 4/14/2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 04/14/2004
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

The following titles are suggested: "Two component wireless keyboard with base" or "removable wireless keyboard with base".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 13 recites the limitation "the first keyboard". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 14 recites the limitation "the first keyboard housing". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claims 13-15 recite the limitation "The second keyboard housing". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. It is believed claims 13-15 were intended to depend on claim 7 and the limitation "The second keyboard housing" refers to as "removable section".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 13-17, 19, 20, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Batra (U.S. Patent 6,317,061), in view of Salmon (Pub. No. 2003/0048256).

As to claim 1, Batra (Fig. 6) discloses a computer keyboard system comprising: a base (14) having a number pad (204) and a removable section (12) having an alphanumeric key cluster (147) and a wireless transmitter (Fig. 4B, 370); the removable section (12) being removably coupleable to the base (14), (col. 1, lines 62-63) wherein the removable section (12) transmits a signal (Fig. 4B, 52) to a host computer (100) via the base. Batra does not teach a biometric reader. Salmon (Fig. 1) teaches a biometric reader (13) for reading a biometric characteristic of a user (paragraph 68). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have added the biometric reader of Salmon to the keyboard of Batra because the biometric reader of salmon would prevent other users to operate the device without permission (i.e. authority) thereby eliminating the security problem caused by other users (see paragraph 68 of Salmon).

Art Unit: 2609

As to claim 16, Batra (Fig. 4B) discloses a computer keyboard (12) configured for wireless communication (106) with a computer (100), comprising: a keyboard housing (14); a keyboard processor (col. 2, line 2) configured to cooperate with a transmitter (350) for wireless communication (106) to a computer (col. 2, line 8-10); and

a removable alphanumeric section (12) having a processor (col. 2, line 2) and

a transmitter (370) for wireless communication (106) to the computer; the alphanumeric section (12) including a group of alphanumeric keys (Fig. 6, 147) being operatively connected to the processor (col. 5, line 53-60). Batra does not teach a fingerprint reader.

Salmon (Fig. 1) teaches a fingerprint reader (13) mounted to the keyboard housing (2) (paragraph 63). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used the biometric reader of Salmon to the keyboard of Batra because the biometric reader of salmon would prevent other users to operate the device without permission (i.e. authority) thereby eliminating the security problem caused by other users (see paragraph 68 of Salmon).

As to claim 6, Salmon teaches (Fig. 1) a biometric reader (13) comprising a fingerprint reader configured to send a decoupling signal so as to decouple the removable (extend the keyboard) from the base (enclosure, 2) responsive to a fingerprint identification of a user (paragraph 68)

As to claim 13, this claim differs from claim 6 only in that the limitations "second keyboard housing" is additionally recited. Batra teaches a second keyboard housing (12) from the first keyboard (14).

Art Unit: 2609

As to claim 20, Salmon (Fig. 1) teaches a fingerprint reader (13) is configured to send a decoupling signal to the keyboard (3) processor (20) responsive to a fingerprint identification of a user (paragraph 68).

As to claims 2 and 17 Batra teaches a computer keyboard (10) system wherein the removable section (12) includes a cursor control device (44).

As to claim 4, Batra teaches a computer keyboard system, wherein the base (14) includes a wireless receiver (Fig. 4B, 375), the wireless receiver being configured to receive wireless signals (375) from the wireless transmitter (370) of the removable section (12) (Fig. 6 refers to 4A and 4B. col. 6, lines 59-60).

As to claim 19, this claim differs from claim 4 only in that the limitation "housing" is additionally recited. Batra clearly teaches a housing (14) includes a wireless receiver (Fig. 4B, 375).

As to claim 7, Batra (Fig. 6) teaches a computer keyboard system, in which the base (14) includes a receiving portion (130) adapted to substantially enclose the removable section (12) therein (col.6, lines 61-63).

As to claim 21, this claim differs from claim 7 in that the limitation "keyboard housing" is additionally recited. Batra teaches a keyboard housing (14) and a removable alphanumeric section (12).

Art Unit: 2609

As to claim 8, Batra (Fig. 2) teaches a computer keyboard (10) system, wherein the removable section (12) removable coupling comprises a media interface (Media interface detail of removable keyboard 12 is shown better in Fig. 6, element 98).

As to claim 14, Batra teaches a computer keyboard system, wherein the second keyboard housing (12) is configurable in an abutment relationship (col. 6, lines 61-62) with the first keyboard housing (14).

As to claim 15, Batra (Fig. 2) teaches, a computer keyboard (10) system, wherein the second keyboard housing (12) removable coupling comprises media interface (Fig. 6, 98) configured to cooperate with the processor (col. 4, lines 59-61).

5. Claims 3 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Batra (U.S. Patent 6,317,061), in view of Salmon (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0048256) as applied to claims 1 and 16, and further in view of Mcloone (U.S. Pub. No. 6,986,614).

As to claim 3 and 18, Batra and Salmon teach a computer keyboard system in accordance with claim 1, but do not teach a scrolling device. Mcloone (Fig. 10) teaches a scrolling device (40). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have added the scrolling device of Mcloone to the keyboard of Batra as modified by Salmon to provide scrolling an image relative to an image display screen along perpendicular axes (col. 2, lines 7-8).

Art Unit: 2609

6. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Batra (U.S. Patent 6,317,061), in view of Salmon (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0048256), as applied to claims 1 and 4, and further in view Cheng (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0174123).

As to claim 5, note the discussion of Batra and Salmon above. Batra and Salmon do not teach a wireless mouse. Cheng (Fig. 4) teaches a computer keyboard (2) system including a wireless mouse (1) configured to wirelessly communicate (paragraph 14) with the wireless receiver (23) of the base (2). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have added the wireless mouse of Cheng to the keyboard of Batra as modified by Salmon because wire and wireless mouse can be substituted each other; the wireless mouse would provide the benefit of carrying from one place to another place easily.

7. Claims 9, 10, 12, 22, and 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Batra (U.S. Patent 6,317,061) in view of Salmon (Pub. No. U.S. 2003/0048256), and further in view of Lin (U.S. Patent 6,529,145).

As to claim 9, Batra discloses a computer keyboard system comprising: a first keyboard housing (14); a number pad (204) with a key cluster (i.e. 210, 206, 208) and a second keyboard housing (12) having an alphanumeric section (147); wherein said second keyboard housing is nestable (col. 6, lines 61-62) within a receiving portion (130) of the first keyboard housing and removably coupleable (col. 7, line 28-30) to the first keyboard housing (14) such that when said first keyboard housing and second keyboard housing are coupled together (col. 6, lines 61-62),

Art Unit: 2609

Batra teaches the first keyboard housing (14) includes a processor (col. 2, line 2) operable to electrically charge to a mobile power source in the second keyboard housing (battery, col. 4, line 44-45). Batra does not teach a biometric reader. Salmon (Fig. 1) teaches a biometric reader (13) for reading a biometric characteristic of a user. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have added the biometric reader of Salmon to the keyboard of Batra because the biometric reader of salmon would prevent other users to operate the device without permission (i.e. authority) thereby eliminating the security problem caused by other users (see paragraph 68 of Salmon).

Batra and Salmon do not teach a processor included in the keyboard housing.

Lin (Fig. 2) teaches a first keyboard housing (1) including a processor therein (col. 1, line 12-13) Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have added the built in processor of Lin to the keyboard of Batra as modified by Salmon because the arrangement of the processor in the keyboard of Lin would benefit of replacing all different kinds of connectors easily (see col. 2, lines 28-30 of Lin)

As to claim 22, Batra teaches a computer keyboard configured for communication with a computer (106), comprising:

- a keyboard housing (10);

- a removable keyboard portion (12) comprising:

- an alphanumeric section (40) including a group of alphanumeric keys (40) being operatively connectable to the keyboard processor (51);

a transmitter (370) for wireless communication (Fig. 4B). Batra does not teach a biometric reader.

Salmon teaches a biometric reader (7) device configured for communicating with the keyboard processor (paragraph 89). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have added the biometric reader of Salmon to the keyboard of Batra because the biometric reader of salmon would prevent other users to operate the device without permission (i.e. authority) thereby eliminating the security problem caused by other users (see paragraph 68 of Salmon).

Batra and Salmon do not teach a processor within the keyboard. Lin teaches a keyboard processor (col. 1, line 12-11) with in the keyboard housing (Fig. 1, 1) for communicating with the computer (col. 1, line 15-16) Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have added the built in processor of Lin to the keyboard of Batra as modified by Salmon because the arrangement of the processor in the keyboard of Lin would benefit of replacing all different kinds of connectors easily (see col. 2, lines 28-30 of Lin)

As to claim 10, Batra teaches a computer keyboard (10) system wherein the second keyboard housing (12) includes a cursor control device (44).

As to claim 12, Batra (Fig. 4B) teaches a computer keyboard (12) wherein the first keyboard housing (14) includes a wireless receiver (345) and the second keyboard housing (12) includes a wireless transmitter (370), the wireless receiver (345) being configured to receive wireless signals (52) from the wireless transmitter (370) of the second keyboard housing (12).

Art Unit: 2609

As to claim 23, Batra (Fig. 2) teaches a computer keyboard (10), wherein the removable keyboard portion (12) includes a cursor control device (44).

8. Claims 11 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Batra (U.S. Patent 6,317,061) in view of Salmon (Pub. No. 2003/0048256) and Lin (U.S. Patent 6,529,145) as applied to claims 9 and 22 above, and further in view of Mcloone (Pub. No. 6,986,614).

As to claims 11 and 24, note the discussion of Batra, Salmon, and Lin above. Batra, Salmon, and Lin do not teach a scrolling device. Mcloone (Fig. 10) teaches a scrolling device (40). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have added the scrolling device of Mcloone to the keyboard of Batra as modified by Salmon and Lin to have provided the keyboard with a scrolling device that scrolls an image relative to an image display screen along perpendicular axes (col. 2, lines 7-8).

9. Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Batra (U.S. Patent 6,317,061) in view of Salmon (Pub. No. 2003/0048256) and Lin (U.S. Patent 6,529,145) as applied to claim 22 above, and further in view of Cheng (Pub. No. 2003/0174123).

As to claim 25, note the discussion in claim 22, Batra, Salmon and Lin do not teach a wireless mouse. Cheng (Fig. 4) teaches a keyboard (2) including a wireless mouse (1) configured for wireless communication (Paragraph 114) with the computer (3) via the keyboard processor (23). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have added the wireless mouse of Cheng to the keyboard of Batra as

Art Unit: 2609

modified by Salmon because wire and wireless mouse can be substituted each other; the wireless mouse would provide the benefit of carrying from one place to another place easily.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Anderson et al. (U.S. Patent 6,104,604) discloses a Modular keyboard.

Inquires

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Pegeman Karimi whose telephone number is (571) 270-1712. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:00am - 5:00pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chanh Nguyen can be reached on (571) 272-7772. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2609

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Pegeman Karimi
1/11/2007


CHANH D. NGUYEN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER